



**AGENDA
CITY OF BRYAN
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Wednesday, 14 September 2005**

**Regular Meeting – 5:30 p.m.
Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 300 S. Texas Avenue**

1. Call to Order
2. Recognition of Visitors
3. Citizens to Be Heard on Items Not on Agenda
4. Recognition of Affidavits for Conflict of Interest
5. Consideration of Minutes — August 10, 2005
6. Public Hearing and Consideration for **200 South Main**
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations
7. Commissioner and Staff Concerns
 - A. Individual Commissioners' Concerns
 - B. Items for Upcoming Agendas
8. Adjournment

09/14/2005
STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF BRAZOS
CITY OF BRYAN

On the 14th day of September 2005, the Historic Landmark Commission of the City of Bryan convened in an open session of their regular meeting in the City Council Chambers of the Bryan Municipal Building at 5:30 p.m. with the following in attendance:

First Name	Last Name	Attended	MHSA	MASA	%	MH6M	MA6M	%
James	Crawley	No	9	7	78%	7	6	86%
James	Ferguson	No	9	8	89%	7	6	86%
Sheila	Fields	Yes	9	8	89%	7	6	86%
Chad	Grauke	Yes	9	8	89%	7	6	86%
George	Hester	Yes	20	18	90%	7	6	86%
Jim	Hiney	Yes	32	27	84%	7	4	57%
Dawn	Jourdan	Yes	9	9	100%	7	7	100%

MHSA: Meetings held since appointment

MH6M: Meetings held in the last 6 months (180 calendar days)

MASA: Meetings attended since appointment

MA6M: Meetings attended in the last 6 months (180 calendar days)

N/A: Percentage not calculated until members have served for 6 months (180 calendar days)

Staff members present: Kathie Blanchard, Downtown Development Planner; Samuel Aguirre, Assistant City Attorney; Stephan Gage, Planning Intern.

1. Call To Order

Chairperson Hester called the meeting to order at 5:34 PM.

2. Recognition Of Visitors

There were two (2) visitors:

1. Michael Schaefer, of 17912 Indian Lakes Drive, College Station, Texas; and,
2. Robert Nelson, of 2505 Oak Circle, Bryan, Texas.

3. Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

4. Recognition Of Affidavits Filed In Response To State Law On Disclosure Of Local Official's Conflict Of Interest

There were none.

5. Consideration Of Minutes

Approval of minutes from August 10, 2005.

Commissioner Hiney asked that the minutes be corrected to reflect that he was in attendance at the August 10th HLC meeting.

Commissioner Hiney made a motion to approve the minutes, as corrected, and Commissioner Jourdan seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Grauke entered at 5:40 PM.

6. Public Hearing/Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 South Main
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations

Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner, presented the staff report (on file in Planning Services). Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the applicant is proposing the following alterations:

1. Installation of various pieces of mechanical equipment associated with the first floor restaurant use on the south façade; and,
2. Installation of copper rain gutters on the west (South Bryan Avenue) façade;
3. Replacement of previously approved and installed pair of 32-inch wood French doors on the west (South Bryan Avenue) façade with a single 36-inch metal door and two 14" cedar panels. Cedar panels, trim, and door will be painted the same color as current French doors; and,
4. Replacement of previously approved and installed pair of 32-inch wood French doors on the first and second floors of the north façade with a single 36-inch metal door with glass sidelights. Door and trim will be painted same color as current French doors; and,
5. Installation of four bell-shaped wall-mounted downlight fixtures on the east (South Main Street) façade and two bell-shaped wall-mounted downlight fixtures on the west (South Bryan Avenue) façades; and,
6. Installation of iron handrail at the main entrance on the east (South Main Street) façade; and,
7. Installation of mechanical equipment on the south façade of the building is a minor exterior alteration necessary for the adaptive reuse of the first floor as restaurant space; no significant architectural features have been altered; that this portion of the façade is the most logical place for service equipment, and staff recommends approval of the request; and,
8. Installation of two copper rain gutters on the west façade of the building are necessary to protect the structure from water damage, and both the material and the placement of said gutters is appropriate, and staff recommends approval of the request; and,
9. The current wood French doors, on the west façade of the building, are not operable or secure due to the unlevelled settling of the historic structure, and staff finds the proposed door scheme to be an acceptable alternative to the current scheme and recommends approval of the replacement, with the conditions that the doors are fashioned of wood rather than metal and that the proposed service entrance doors utilize glass sidelights rather than cedar panels; and,
10. The wall-mounted bell/tulip design of the fixtures is appropriate in the Downtown district; however, the placement of the exterior light fixtures is inappropriate in the original transom openings of the east (South Main Street) and west (South Bryan Avenue) façades. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that staff recommends approval of the current placement of light fixtures, with the condition that they be attached to the underlying structure, preferably above the transom windows, rather than in the voids of the building; and,
11. The applicant has indicated a liability concern over the steep front entry step, and has installed a handrail at this location to provide a visual cue for restaurant patrons. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that staff has allowed the

temporary placement of this handrail until its design is approved by the Commission. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that staff recognizes that both the placement and material of the handrail are appropriate; however, staff finds that the handrail is not proportional with the main entry, and recommends denial of the current handrail design. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that should the Commission deny the current handrail proposal, staff will allow the temporary placement of said handrail until an alternate can be designed and installed in this location.

The Commission discussed the following with staff:

1. What is wrong with the handrail that has been installed; and,

Staff responded that while the handrail materials were appropriate, the size of the handrail in proportion to the entrance door is excessive.

2. What changes would Staff recommend to make the handrail more appropriate; and,

Staff responded that the applicant would be required to meet any building code regulations.

3. Why is a certificate of appropriateness being sought for equipment and material which have already been installed; and,

Staff responded that due to miscommunication between staff and the applicant, actions were taken which were not authorized.

4. If the light fixtures which staff recommends denial of were moved, would they be affixed to the brick façade or some other structure on the building; and,

Staff responded that the fixtures would be affixed to the brick façade if they were moved.

5. Are the light fixtures simply decoration or is the applicant required to provide lighting?

Staff responded that the applicant is not required to provide lighting around the building.

The public hearing was opened.

Robert Nelson, of 2505 Oak Circle, Bryan, Texas, informed the Commission of the following:

1. He is the owner of Doe's Restaurant; and,
2. Also owns a door manufacturing business; and,
3. Very concerned about the front entrance because several patrons have either fallen down or nearly fallen down entering or exiting the restaurant; and,
4. Handrail was installed immediately after these incidences; and,
5. Handrail ironwork meets the ironwork on the fire escape stair which makes it appropriate.

The Commission discuss the following with Mr. Nelson:

1. Does the railing truly solve the patron ingress/egress problem at the restaurant; and,

Mr. Nelson responded that the handrail be redesign to turn outward to draw attention to the step at the front entrance.

2. When was the decision made to install the light fixtures in their current location; and,

Mr. Nelson responded that he was not consult about the light fixtures, and was not

aware of any problems with their placement until recently.

3. Why were metal doors proposed as replacements for the French doors?

Mr. Nelson responded that the doors in question are service doors and fire exits, therefore in order to meet the Fire Code, metal doors would be preferred.

Michael Schafer, of 17912 Indian Lakes Drive, College Station, Texas, informed the Commission of the following:

1. Light fixtures were installed prior to the last HLC meeting; and,
2. Lights shall not be rises any higher because a canopy can not be installed; and,
3. Other redeveloped properties are using incandescent lights; and,
4. Lights help to illuminate the front step; and,
5. If lights were moved higher, the junction boxes would be surface-mounted; and,
6. Handrail was hastily installed for safety reason; and,
7. Front step was design and installed by the City of Bryan; and,
8. Front step should be painted.

The Commission discuss the following with Mr. Schafer:

1. Is the property line at the entrance of the building; and,

Mr. Schafer responded that the property line extends from the building about 3-4 feet.

2. Would the City of Bryan have grant permit for alterations to the front step of the building; and,

Mr. Schafer responded that the City of Bryan would not have to grant permit because the alteration is minor and temporary.

3. Why are metal doors being proposed as replacements for the French doors; and,

Mr. Schafer responded that he would prefer fiberglass door over wood or metal.

4. Are the double doors on the west façade new doors?

Mr. Schafer responded that doors were new.

The public hearing was closed.

The Commission agreed by unanimous consent to divide the question into numbered articles (1 thru 6) as listed under the *Analysis of Issues* in the staff report. Listed above as Items 1-6 under the record of Ms. Blanchard's staff report for agenda item #6.

Commissioner Grauke made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Articles 1 and 2, and Commissioner Jourdan seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Articles 1 and 2 was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Gruake made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 5, and Commissioner Jourdan seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed the following:

1. Although the installed prior to approval from the Commission, the Commission has worked to encourage the installation of lighting Downtown, and these lights will contribute to that objective; and,
2. The lights are a temporary fixture which can be easily removed; and,

3. The lights are close to the ground and will provide adequate illumination.

Commissioner Jourdan move to amend the previous motion by adding the condition that the light fixtures installed along the East façade (Main Street) of the building be removed when Doe's Restaurant ceases operations at this location, and Commissioner Fields seconded the amendment.

The amendment to the previous motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 5, as amended, was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Hiney made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 6, allowing the handrails that have been install at the front entrance to remain in place provided the developer submits a plan for the redesign of said handrails for approval by the Commission by the deadline of the next regularly schedule Commission meeting, and Commissioner Fields seconded the motion.

The Commission discuss the following:

1. Is the application deadline for the next regularly scheduled meeting realistically enough time for the developer to submit redesigned handrail plans; and,
2. The developer should pursue an architectural study of what is appropriate at the entrance of a building of this scale and what types of safety mechanisms are available/appropriate for an entrance of this type; and,
3. The handrails are a voluntary, reversible improvement which is not aesthetically offensive, and safety is not the concern of the Commission; and,
4. A front door railing is not aesthetically the same as a fire escape railing and more consideration should be given to the aesthetics of the front door railing; and,
5. While the developer's concern for safety is commendable, a more sensitive and architectural appropriate solution should be adopted.

Commissioner Jourdan move to amend the previous motion by adding that the developer be given 90 days from the date the current meeting (December 13, 2005) to submit redesigned handrail plans to the Commission for approval, and Commissioner Fields seconded the amendment.

The amendment to the previous motion was passed with a 4-1 vote.

The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 6, as amended, was passed with a 4-1 vote.

Commissioner Gruake made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 4, and Commissioner Fields seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 4 was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Jourdan made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 3 as submitted, and Commissioner Hiney seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed the following:

1. The cedar infill panel may not be appropriate; and,
2. The final appearance will depend on the detailing of the doors.

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 3, as submitted, was defeated by a 2-3 vote.

Commissioner Gruake made a motion to reconsider the vote on the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 3, and Commissioner Hester seconded the motion.

The motion to reconsider was passed with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Gruake move to amend the motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 3 by adding that pre-hung door units with fixed glass sidelights be used in place of cedar infill panels, and Commissioner Hiney seconded the amendment.

The amendment to the previous motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Article 3, as amended, was passed with a unanimous vote.

7. Commissioner And Staff Concerns

A. Individual Commissioner's Concerns

Commissioner Fields reported that her 2nd grade class took a walking tour through the historic district, and shared a booklet with the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Hester comments that developers seeking approval for a completed project is a serious problem. Commissioner Hester also commented that the approval process is not being followed.

Commissioner Jourdan comments that the problem is lack of code enforcement to prevent unauthorized construction. Commissioner Jourdan further commented that some of the recent problems with project approvals might be resolve by giving staff more discretionary power in the revised Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Staff reported that significant progress has been made on the revised Historic Preservation Ordinance, and an ordinance subcommittee meeting will be scheduled some time in the near future.

Ms. Blanchard announced that she is left the City of Bryan to assume a new position with a private firm in Bryan, but said she still plans to remain active in Downtown Bryan affairs.

B. Items for Upcoming Agendas

The redesign handrail will be presented in 90 days.

8. Adjournment

Commissioner Grauke made the motion to adjourn, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Hiney.

There being no other business, the September 14th Regular Meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission adjourned at 7:12 PM.

THESE MINUTES SHALL SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL FINDINGS OF THE HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION, AS APPROVED THIS XXth DAY OF XXXX, 200X.

Signature of File

Chairperson of the Historic Landmark Commission